

The Wigner-Weyl formalism and the relativistic semi-classical approximation 1

J. Mourad *

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et Hautes Energies 2
Université de Paris-Sud, bât 211, 91405 Orsay, France.

Abstract: The relativistic semi-classical approximation for a free massive particle is studied using the Wigner-Weyl formalism. A non-covariant Wigner function is defined using the Newton-Wigner position operator. The perturbative solution for the time evolution is found. Causality is found to be perturbatively respected.

¹ Work supported in part by CEC Science project SC1-CT91-0729.

* E-mail: MOURAD@QCD.UPS.CIRCE.FR

² Laboratoire associé au CNRS.

1 Introduction.

The Wigner-Weyl formalism [1] offers a classical-like formulation of quantum mechanics using phase space functions as observables and the Wigner function as an analogue of the Liouville density function. It has been used to study semi-classical non-relativistic quantum mechanics for time evolution [2] and spectra determination [3]. Relativistic generalizations of the Wigner function have been proposed [4], they are manifestly covariant and are not suitable to study the semi-classical approximation. The problem lies in the fact that the natural position operator in a manifestly covariant representation of a wave equation (as is the Dirac representation for a spin 1/2 particle) does not have a clear semi-classical limit; the Dirac position operator, for instance, gives rise to a velocity that is always equal to the speed of light. Another drawback of the manifestly covariant representation that is related to the preceding one is that it has more than one irreducible representation of the Poincaré group corresponding to more than one particle (an electron and a positron for the Dirac case). In this letter we propose a new definition of the Wigner function that uses a Foldy-Wouthuysen representation [5] or equivalently the Newton-Wigner position operator [6]. We solve perturbatively its time evolution and conclude with some remarks.

2 Wigner-Weyl formalism

The Wigner-Weyl formalism associates a phase space function to an operator acting on Hilbert space :

$$\hat{A} \rightarrow a(x, p),$$

such that

$$\hat{P} \rightarrow p$$

$$\hat{X} \rightarrow x,$$

$\hat{P}$ and $\hat{X}$ are respectively the momentum and position operator. The wave function or the density matrix are replaced by the Wigner function:

$$\hat{\rho} \rightarrow f(x, p).$$

This mapping has the following fundamental properties:

$$Tr(\hat{A}\hat{\rho}) = \int dx dp a f, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\hat{A}\hat{B} \rightarrow ab + O(\hbar), \quad (2.2)$$

$$\frac{-i}{\hbar}[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \rightarrow \{a, b\} + O(\hbar). \quad (2.3)$$

This mapping offers a way to express quantum mechanics using a classical language [1], making clear the two conceptual differences between the classical and the quantum theory:

-A kinematical one due to the fact that the Wigner function and the Liouville density do not belong to the same space, a density function does not correspond in general to a positive density matrix via the Wigner-Weyl correspondance, nor does a Wigner function have to be positive. As an example the function

$$f = \delta(x)\delta(p)$$

is a Liouville density but not a Wigner function (it violates the uncertainty relations).

- A dynamical one due to the different equations obeyed by the two functions. For a free non-relativistic particle there is only a kinematical difference.

In this letter we are only interested in the dynamical semiclassical limit, one can take a Wigner function that is also a density function at $t = 0$ and compare the classical and quantum evolution.

In order for the observable and its corresponding phase space function to have the same physical content, we add the requirement

$$\hat{X}_{NW} \rightarrow x, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\hat{X}_{NW}$ is the Newton-Wigner position operator. We make the assumption that the physical position is described by the Newton-Wigner position operator. This is the main difference between our Wigner-Weyl correspondance and the manifestly covariant one, where the manifestly covariant position operator plays the role of $\hat{X}_{NW}$. We now give the formulae relating the phase space function and the Wigner function with the quantum operator and the density matrix in a representation independant form:

$$a(x, p) = 2Tr \left(\hat{A} e^{\frac{2i}{\hbar} (\hat{X}_{NW} p - x \hat{P})} \hat{\mathcal{P}} \right), \quad (2.5a)$$

$$f(x, p) = \frac{1}{(\pi\hbar)^d} Tr \left(\hat{\rho} e^{\frac{2i}{\hbar} (\hat{X}_{NW} p - x \hat{P})} \hat{\mathcal{P}} \right), \quad (2.5b)$$

d is the space dimension, $\hat{P}$ is the momentum operator and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ is the parity operator. These formulae (2.5) apply to a spin zero massive particle, generalization to spinning massive particles is straightforward. Expressing the Newton-Wigner operator is easy in the Foldy representation [6], where the time evolution of the wave function is given by (c=1)

$$i\partial_t \psi = (p^2 + m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi, \quad (2.6)$$

the scalar product is:

$$\int dp \psi^* \phi,$$

and the Newton-Wigner operator is:

$$\hat{X}_{NW} = i \frac{\partial}{\partial P}. \quad (2.7)$$

This representation may be used to write the Wigner function in a more familiar way, when the density matrix is a pure state, evaluation of (2.5b) gives

$$f(x, p) = \frac{1}{(\pi\hbar)^d} \int dq \psi^* \left(p - \frac{q}{2} \right) \psi \left(p + \frac{q}{2} \right) e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} q x}. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that this function is not manifestly covariant, it becomes so in the classical approximation.

3 Time evolution

We restrict ourselves to a one dimensional spinless massive particle. The equation governing the time evolution of the Wigner function is easily seen to be

$$\partial_t f_t = \frac{i}{\hbar} \left[h \left(p + \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) - h \left(p - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) \right] f_t, \quad (3.1)$$

$$h(p) = (p^2 + m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.2)$$

Expansion in powers of $\hbar$ gives the following equation:

$$\partial_t f_t = -\frac{p}{h(p)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} f_t - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{i\hbar}{2} \right)^{2n} \frac{h^{(2n+1)}(p)}{(2n+1)!} \frac{\partial^{2n+1}}{\partial x^{2n+1}} f_t, \quad (3.3)$$

where $h^{(m)}(p)$ is the m^{th} derivative of $h(p)$. The first term on the right hand side is the classical Liouville term and the second gives the quantum correction to the classical motion. Note that in the non-relativistic limit only the first term survives. One can solve this equation perturbatively and gets the following solution:

$$f_t(x, p) = \hat{Q}(t) f_t^{cl}(x, p), \quad (3.4)$$

$$\hat{Q}(t) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \hbar^{2n} \hat{Q}_n(t), \quad (3.5)$$

where f_t^{cl} is the classical solution and $\hat{Q}_n(t)$ is a time-dependant differential operator that we can calculate using the following recursion formula

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_1 &= t \frac{h^{(3)}(p)}{24} \frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3}, \\ \hat{Q}_n &= \frac{(-1)^{n+1} t}{2^{2n} (2n+1)!} h^{(2n+1)}(p) \frac{\partial^{2n+1}}{\partial x^{2n+1}} - \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \int_0^{-t} d\tau \hat{Q}'_p(\tau) \hat{Q}_{n-p}(-\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where the prime is for the time derivative. The $\hbar$ expansion giving the solution is an asymptotic one, the first few terms give a good approximation of the exact solution if the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\Delta x \gg \frac{\hbar}{m} = \lambda, \quad t \ll \Delta x \left(\frac{\Delta x}{\lambda} \right)^2,$$

Δx is the characteristic scale of f_t . Note that to any finite order in $\hbar$ causality is respected since the quantum solution is obtained from the classical one by application of a differential operator; causality violation [7] is non-perturbative in $\hbar$.

4 Summary and conclusion

We defined a new non-covariant Wigner function that is suitable to study the semiclassical limit for a relativistic particle. A representation independent form has been given for this function and for other phase space functions. In the Foldy representation where positive and negative energy states are decoupled, the expression for the Wigner function looks like the non-relativistic one. The equation governing its free time evolution was perturbatively solved. Quantum corrections to the Liouville dynamics become important for long times or states better localized than the Compton wavelength. One can consider a particle in an external potential, whenever this potential is a function of $\hat{X}_{NW}$ no complications arise, but if one considers more realistic potentials, as the usual Coulomb potential, one has a coupling between positive and negative energy states and relativistic quantum mechanics of a particle loses its validity.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Pr R. Omnes for discussions.

References

- [1] H. Weyl, Z. Phys. 46 (1927) 1; E.P Wigner, Phys. Rev. 40 (1932) 749; G.A. Baker Jr., Phys. Rev. 109 (1958) 2196; J.E. Moyal, Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. 45 (1949) 99; for reviews, see N.L. Balazs and B.K. Jennings, Phys. Rep. 104 (1984) 347; M.Hillery, R.F. O'Connell, M. Scully, and E.P. Wigner, Phys. Rep. 106 (1984) 121.
- [2] E.J. Heller, J. Chem. Phys. 65 (1976) 1289; *ibid.* 67 (1977) 3339; M.V. Berry and N.L. Balazs, J. Phys. A 12 (1979) 625; R. Omnes, J. Stat. Phys. 57 (1989) 357.
- [3] A. Voros, Annl. Inst. Poincaré xxiv (1976) 31; *ibid.* xxvi (1977) 343; M.V. Berry, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. 287 (1977) 237.
- [4] S. de Groot, La transformée de Weyl et la fonction de Wigner: une forme alternative de la mécanique quantique (Les presses de l'université de Montréal, 1974) ; S. de Groot, W.A. van Leeuwen and C.G. Van Weert, Relativistic kinetic theory (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1980); P.R. Holland, A. Kypriandis, Z. Maric and J.P. Vigier, Phys. Rev. A 33 (1986) 4380; R. Hakim and H. Sivak, Ann. Phys. (N.Y) 139 (1982) 230, and references therein.
- [5] L.L. Foldy and S.A. Wouthuysen Phys. Rev 78 (1950) 29 ; L.L. Foldy Phys. Rev. 102 (1956) 568.
- [6] T.D. Newton and E.P. Wigner, Rev. Mod. Phys. 21 (1949) 400.
- [7] G.C. Hegerfeldt, Phys. Rev. D 10 (1974) 3220; G.C. Hegerfeldt and S.N.M. Ruijsenaars, Phys. Rev. D 22 (1980) 377; G.C. Hegerfeldt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 2395.